

**REMARKS**

The Applicants request reconsideration of the rejection.

The Applicants' representative thanks the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the telephone interview of April 9, 2009. During the interview, it is believed that the outstanding issue regarding 35 U.S.C. §101 is overcome by the above amendments to claim 34. In addition, the Applicants have amended independent claims 34, 46 and 48 to address comments raised during the interview with regard to the term element and the expression element-designated. These amendments will be discussed more fully below.

In the Reply filed March 10, 2009, the Applicants discuss the Examiner's comments on page 8 of the Final Office Action, and in particular the allusion that the claims, as finally rejected, raised a question of unpatentability under 35 U.S.C. §101. During the telephone interview mentioned above, the Examiner indicated that the "computer-implemented method" required computer structure to be recited within the body of the claim. Accordingly, claim 34 has been amended to recite the structure for performing the various functions. It is believed, then, that agreement was reached that the §101 issue has been removed with regard to claims 34-41. In the Reply filed March 10, 2009, the outstanding rejection of claims 34-41 and 46-48, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tateno, U.S. Patent No. 5,778,400 (Tateno) in view of Aoyama et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,956,726 (Aoyama) was addressed. Those remarks are incorporated herein by reference, but not repeated so as to avoid unnecessary duplication.

A final point of discussion was raised during the telephone interview, with regard to the Examiner's concern that the terms element-designated and element

may be overly “broad and varied” and thus insufficiently definite to determine the scope of the claims. In Reply, the Applicants note that the term element refers to the basic structure of a structured document (such as an SGML, HTML, etc. document) as is well known. In addition, the present specification and drawings indicate consistent usage of “elements” in accordance with their known meaning in structured documents. See, for example, Table 303 in Fig. 3, which shows that which is registered as an analyzed structured document (converted from the tree structure of the structured document 302 also shown in Fig. 3). Independent claims 34, 46 and 48 have thus been amended to define the structured document as comprising “a plurality of elements as its basic structure.” In addition, “element-designated” has been deleted from the preamble of each of these claims, as being redundant in view of the foregoing amendment.

The Applicants’ representative invites the Examiner to telephone him at the number below to discuss any aspect of this Reply.

To the extent necessary, Applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the

deposit account of Brundidge & Stanger, P.C., Deposit Account No. 50-4888  
(referencing attorney docket no. ASA-724-02).

Respectfully submitted,

BRUNDIDGE & STANGER, P.C.

/Daniel J. Stanger/  
Daniel J. Stanger  
Registration No. 32,846

DJS/sdb  
(703) 684-1470